•	YORK : NASSAU COUNTY	
l l	PART 43	
THE PEOPLE O	F THE STATE OF NEW YORK,	
	-against-	INDICTMENT NO. 742N/14
DANIEL RAMOS	•	NYSID NO.
	Defendant.	9900205N
	252 Old Country Pond	
	252 Old Country Road Mineola, N.Y. 11501	
	July 24, 2015	
	MINUTES OF SENTENCE	
BEFORE:	HON. TERESA K. CORRIGAN	
APPEARA	Acting Supreme Court Justi	rce
APPEARA		
	HON. MADELINE SINGAS Acting District Attorney of	of Nassau County
	BY: ANTHONY PERRI, ESQ., Assistant District Attorne	
	Of Counsel, for the People	9
	HON. KENT MOSTON NASSAU COUNTY LEGAL AID SO	
	Attorney for the Defendant 40 Main Street	
	Hempstead, New York 11550 BY: MICHAEL BERGER, ESQ.	J
ALSO PRESENT	•	
	Official Spanish Interpret	cer
	Cindy Kaye-Fink Senior Court Reporter	

1	THE CLERK: Indictment 742N of 2014, People of	
2	the State of New York vs. Daniel Ramos. Appearances,	
3	for the record.	
4	MR. PERRI: Assistant District Attorney	
5	Anthony Perri.	
6	MR. BERGER: Michael Berger, Legal Aid	
7	Society.	
8	THE CLERK: And you are Daniel Ramos?	
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
10	THE CLERK: And you appear with your attorney,	
11	Mr. Berger, who is seated at the defense counsel table	
12	with you?	
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
14	THE CLERK: Let the record reflect there is	
15	also a sworn Spanish interpreter present.	
16	And sir, could you please put your appearance	
17	on the record.	
18	THE INTERPRETER: Rodolfo Escalante, court	
19	interpreter.	
20	THE CLERK: This case is on for sentence	
21	today. Is your client ready for sentence?	
22	MR. BERGER: Yes, your Honor.	
23	THE CLERK: People wish to be heard before	
24	sentence is imposed?	
25	MR. PERRI: Yes, your Honor, the People will	

be recommending to the Court that the defendant, having been convicted of a Class B violent sexual felony, be sentenced to a period of incarceration of 20 years.

We have had multiple conversations with the victim and her mother, Crystal Ramirez, after the trial was completed. The defendant was convicted. The family has repeatedly asked us to express to the Court their desire that the defendant be sentenced to the maximum period of incarceration of 25 years.

Crystal Ramirez, the mother of the child victim, who was six years old on the date of incident, expressed that the trauma of having to testify at trial for both her children that the defendant put them through, and the ongoing necessity of both therapy for her daughter, her daughter still referencing the events that have occurred and expressing fear the defendant would ever be released from jail, have impelled her to ask us for a period of maximum incarceration.

The People are asking for 20 years, however, your Honor, in light of the fact that the defendant does have no prior criminal contact with the criminal justice system, but this defendant turned down other multiple recommendations by the People on the B felony, including five years prior to indictment, ten years prior to trial, and as he has shown no remorse for his actions

1.6

and not acknowledged any of his guilt, taking the stand at the trial and providing implausible, from the People's position and from the jury's determination, an implausible story as to how his DNA was on the inside of Mya Ramirez's underwear in a saliva stain, the People say that that is an exacerbating circumstance.

Additionally, defense counsel elicited testimony from Mya Ramirez at trial, although the Court did rule in defense counsel's favor with respect to a Molineux application of multiple other instances of sexual contact between this defendant and the child victim, Mya Ramirez, that included not only oral sex with which he was charged, but attempted anal sex with Mya Ramirez, and that there was not simply one instance, but multiple prior instances that she consistently testified about in a limited credible manner stating that there were five other incidents or five total incidents that had occurred.

Your Honor, the Court should take that into consideration as it considers the character of the defendant, the nature of the defendant's conduct, and that he was convicted of one instance that was actually part of a course of conduct against this child.

For these reasons, your Honor, the People ask the Court to sentence the defendant to a period of

20 years of incarceration and that afterwards a maximum period of post-release supervision, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Counsel, do you wish to be heard before sentence is imposed?

MR. BERGER: Yes, your Honor. For Mr. Perri to ask this Court for 20 years, to me is beyond the realm of sanity, of reasonableness, because the People, as Mr. Perri stated, asked for five years pre-indictment, which is the minimum, seven years prior to trial, and that would mean that they determined that those minimal sentences were reasonable for these acts committed, based upon the defendant's lack of any prior record.

So it's distressing to hear Mr. Perri ask for that and I would ask the Court to consider in the remarks that I'm making today on behalf of Mr. Ramos, that it's Mr. Perri, who has extremely limited experience in these sex cases, I've been doing it for nearly 44 years with the Legal Aid Society and practicing for 50, and for him to make a recommendation of 20 years under these circumstances, shows to me a lack of serious judgment.

Now, I would suggest to the Court that

1.8

25

Mr. Perri's lack of serious judgment was exhibited

through the trial when, for example, he cited the Ludwig 2 3 case to you to support a principle of law --MR. PERRI: Your Honor --4 5 MR. BERGER: Excuse me, Mr. Perri, I didn't This is counsel's argument to the Court. 6 interrupt you. 7 So Mr. Perri, we're going to let THE COURT: Mr. Berger speak and then you will have a chance to 8 9 respond. .10 MR. BERGER: To cite the Ludwig case to the Court to support a principle that we had a legal 11 12 argument during the trial and then it was clearly 13 evident after reading the case, and the Court as well 14 acknowledged the Ludwig case didn't apply, just 15 suggested to me that Mr. Perri engaged in all sorts of 16 conduct here at this trial that didn't matter whether or 17 not it was legally arguable. The Ludwig case, he just 18 threw it out there in the hope that maybe the Court 19 would buy it. And I understand the Court didn't feel that 20 Mr. Perri made any bad-faith arguments during the course 21 22 of summation. You and I, we respectfully disagree on 23 that point. I pointed that out at the time. There's 24 such a thing, Judge, as wanting to win so badly that you

go beyond what's reasonable and you become excessive in

your zealous representation of the People. That's what I suggest to this Court Mr. Perri did. And that's what I suggest to the Court is evident here during the course of this recommendation of 20 years.

The height of Mr. Perri's bad faith argument was when he suggested to the jury that our DNA expert could have tested and made tests to establish whatever the support for the argument that I had made during summation. Clearly this was engaging in burden shifting. Clearly the judge, you had to correct that in your charge to the jury. So Mr. Perri was either ignorant of the rules in the County Court and that you don't engage in burden shifting or he knew about it and went ahead and did it anyway. In either case, it's a reflection of Mr. Perri's either poor judgment or ignorance that he did those things during the course of this trial.

Now, Mr. Perri brings up the fact that there was a Molineux application. If you recall, Judge, the Molineux application was -- and of course, Judge, this is all in the contexts of the defendant never having done anything here. I understand the jury has spoken, and I will not contest that at this point. I will contest it factually, that Mr. Ramos did anything here, but Mr. Perri, in making a Molineux application to the

Court, made the claim that the defendant put his penis on Mya's butt, not in her butt, on her butt. And then Mya Hernandez [sic] makes the statement while she's testifying here at trial, that the defendant put his penis in her butt five times and then it changes to three times or two times, but the point is that it now became in her butt, which is belied by the nurse examiner's testimony that she thoroughly examined the girl, thoroughly got a history, no mention of penis in the butt at all. The physical findings in the medical report do not show anything about a penis going into the butt of a six-year old, which would have really caused some kind of trauma and damage there. None of that was And yet, Mr. Perri adopts that in his summation there. to the jury. He actually adopts the statement made by Mya, which was never made to him, except she made this claim on the witness stand about pecker in the butt, and he adopts it.

And I suggest, your Honor, there's something improper about doing that. When you, as a district attorney, spoke to the witness, know that in fact the witness has said he put his penis on her butt and then adopts in summation a claim by Mya which he should know from the factual evidence from the nurse examiner's report, can't be true, but he adopts it anyway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So when you combine that with his burden shifting attempt in his summation, I just suggest that the recommendation by Mr. Perri should not be taken seriously, when, in fact, the People had been ready to give him five years pre-indictment and seven years post-indictment.

Now, Judge, we've had our legal disagreements during the course of this trial, but the jury has spoken. You must act accordingly. But I would suggest to your Honor that when you have a situation in which the minimum is five and the maximum is 25, you can't get a better case than this to give the minimum.

Mr. Ramos has led an exemplary life. These charges have besmirched his reputation, but other than that, we brought in character witnesses, people who are not related, who had dealt with Mr. Ramos and he, having dealt with their children, had only the kindest and best things to say about him.

Mr. Perri would make -- have you believe that this is a person who has engaged in this kind of reprehensible conduct throughout his life with children and that's not demonstrated at all. He couldn't even bring in evidence of a negative character of Mr. Ramos and he could have done that, but he didn't do it, because there was nobody to say anything negative about

ckf

Mr. Ramos and his dealing with children and his kindness and gentleness with children, which we demonstrated here during the course of the trial.

So we have a situation in which a man lives an exemplar life as a bus driver for children. Nobody ever complains about his behavior towards children there. In his dealings socially with friends of the family who had always brought their children over his house, nobody made any complaints there, but what do we have in this situation? We have a woman, who even by Mr. Perri's own admission is crude, classless, in my view, who did so much damage to her children. Judge, she is the one —you know, this charge, the charges the defendant with acts that affect the moral well being of a child. It is Mya's mother who has done more damage to the moral well being of not only Mya, but Sincere.

Now, often we hear in these cases, if you go to trial, you have to pay a penalty for going to trial. And what I'm suggesting to the Court here, this is one of those rare cases when you have an individual with an exemplary life, one son who's in the military, another son who's a working person, and you have somebody with an exemplary life, you don't punish somebody for going to trial when he claims he's innocent. The Court regrettably must impose a sentence of at least five

years, but we don't punish people for making them go to trial.

Now, often the argument is by the prosecution, Mr. Perri didn't say it, but I've dealt with enough of the sex cases to know, and we want to spare the children from testifying in court, and yes, that's an argument that can be made, except that it shouldn't apply to Mr. Ramos for two reasons. One, he maintains his innocence and he should be entitled to have a trial by jury, and two, Mr. Perri wasn't thinking about the children when he put Sincere on the witness stand.

Now, we saw Sincere. Sincere is a victim of sexual abuse. We know that. That happened to him when he was three or four years old. We witnessed his demeanor on the witness stand and on the witness stand, his head would drop, questions would be asked and ten, 15 seconds would go by before he gave an answer. He'd look around in an uncomfortable way. This is a youngster who was really, really in trouble and troubled and troubled, we know he's troubled. You take a look at Mya, Mya's demeanor was nothing like that at all. These things were fictions made up.

I made my argument in summation. I understand the jury has spoken, but when you take a look at Mya -- by the way, Mr. Perri talks about therapy, Mya was going

to therapy in this place, in the South Shore Guidance Center, before any charges here were even made.

Now, we were not privy to that, I understand, but the point is, don't talk about therapy required for the children and therefore, they want 20 years or 25 years, when she was going to therapy before this incident was even charged. And I'm suggesting to the Court that it was Mya and Sincere's mother who was a drinker, a smoker, a partier. Mr. Ramos would baby-sit for the kids when she went out partying. You heard testimony with respect to what little regard she had for her children at times when she was doing the drinking and partying. I mean, this is the person who has done more moral damage to the children than anyone.

Now, I just would like to point out that while it does go to the credibility of Mya, and that's not an issue now for the sentence, but you should be aware of the following, Judge. The probation report that I have read suggests that not only did the defendant do what is claimed he did in licking her cuchi on the date in question, but the probation report also says that Mya says Mr. Ramos forced her to lick his pecker. That was the language there. Then we have the claim about penis on the buttock, then we have the claim about the penis — the pecker in the butt.

So we now have four different claims of acts claimed by this girl, only one other one was given to Mr. Perri by Mya two months or -- one to two months prior to the beginning of the trial, and that was pecker on the butt. So we have a young girl whose credibility is seriously in question and if the People are going to attempt to claim, as Mr. Perri did, about other acts that had gone on, then you must take into consideration the fact that from my perspective, there were no other acts, that the credibility of Mya is in serious doubt, now that we've added a fourth sexual act that was alleged to have occurred.

The fact of the matter is that the person to blame primarily for all of this is Crystal Ramirez, Mya and Sincere's mother. She was present when Sincere was violated when he was three years old, actually in the room when his uncle forced Sincere to engage in sexual acts. And that's why we see Sincere here.

So if Mr. Perri was caring about the well being of a child and the trauma to Sincere, he should never have put him on, because all Sincere did was get up there and a give ridiculous testimony about he denied it, he denied it, he denied it and then he admitted it. And nobody else confirmed that. He was standing on the porch with Crystal and Mya, though Mya is too young

perhaps to remember that, but Crystal never said that that's what Daniel Ramos said. It wasn't really necessary to put him on the witness stand. In fact, the expert called by Mr. Perri talked about engaging in conduct that enables you to gain the confidence of the parents so you can be alone with them and do whatever sexual acts you want. That didn't even happen here. Sincere was in the house, Crystal was there and Crystal, according to her testimony, was expecting all kinds of people to come over, because there was the death of a friend. So where was this devious act to try to get Mya alone? It wasn't there. It doesn't exist. What I'm suggesting is that if anybody is guilty of doing damage to these children, it's Crystal.

Now, finally, Judge, it seems to me that if the legislature passes the law that says five is the minimum and 25 is the max, you should not penalize Mr. Ramos for going to trial and exercising his constitutional right to a trial by jury. I think if you were to give him the minimum, which the People were okay with five pre-indictment, and they were okay with seven post-indictment. What Mr. Perri is saying to you is that we should penalize a person for going to trial.

Now, I understand that's the rule in 95 percent of the cases, because very often we have

somebody with a prior record and he doesn't like the numbers, he goes to trial. But when you have somebody with an unblemished record, pristine record, going to trial in a case like this, it seems to me, Judge, you should not impose a punishment for going to trial under these circumstances.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Berger.

Mr. Perri, let me just hear from -- actually, Mr. Perri, go ahead and make your record. Just don't rehash the trial, I sat through it. Just with regards to what you feel needs to be addressed.

MR. PERRI: Your Honor, the People would just like to put on the record that they dispute the characterization of the defense of the testimony that was put forth at trial and urge the Court to disregard the multiple unfounded, irrational personal attacks by the defense on the People, on the prosecution in this case and on Crystal Ramirez, the mother of the victim.

The People are not asking the Court to punish the defendant for exercising his constitutional rights. The People's recommendation of five prior to indictment, seven years prior to hearing and ten priors to trial, years of incarceration, are reasonable, that as defense counsel has just exhibited, shows in his argument, the defendant has no remorse for his actions and does not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

speak.

accept any responsibility for his actions and that is the reason why by going to trial and still to this day not accepting responsibility, an enhanced level of punishment for that and for putting the children through the trial is required, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. MR. BERGER: Judge, just to response to the last comment. THE COURT: You have one minute. MR. BERGER: What Mr. Perri is saying is that he has no remorse. Does Mr. Perri not realize that people go to trial who are innocent? Does he not recognize that the system is flawed and sometimes the innocent get convicted? Does he not realized that new evidence, DNA and other evidence coming to light years later after convictions exonerate people? Mr. Perri expect Mr. Ramos to admit and be remorseful when his position is that he didn't do anything and didn't do what was charged here? I mean, that just again, reflects an unrealistic evaluation and analysis of what happens here in this court system. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Please ask the defendant if he would like to

THE CLERK:

Mr. Ramose, is there anything that

you wish to say before sentence is imposed?

THE DEFENDANT: I just used to help the woman.

I just used to help the mother with her childs [sic] and

I didn't want anything in return on good faith. I just

used to help her, without getting anything back from

her, not even a favor from her. Everything they are

saying here, what he says is just lies.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Let me just start by saying that when the Court imposes a sentence after trial, it is not imposing a sentence that is a penalty for an individual going to trial. There is no place for that and that is not how this Court operates. So this sentence is not in any way, shape or form a penalty for going to trial. Rather, it will be a sentence that is allowed by the legislature when it put forth the sentencing guidelines for a conviction for this level felony.

Second, let me say that what could be characterized and what Mr. Perri characterized as the personal attacks against him during this sentencing procedure is also going to play no part in the Court's sentencing. I will state, however, that throughout the trial, I did not find that the People acted in bad faith at any turn, nor did I find that Mr. Berger acted in bad faith at any turn.

Mr. Ramos. I say to you, sir, and I note from the probation report, that you profess your innocence, and after a jury has found you guilty, you profess your innocence, despite your statement to the police, a statement you admit is yours, but for those sentences that specifically mention the criminal activity. You profess your innocence, despite the fact that your DNA was found on the inside of the child's underwear in the vaginal area. You put forth an expert regarding that DNA and the jury clearly rejected your explanation as to how your DNA got on that part of the underwear.

You told this jury how you barely spoke
English, yet you interacted with this family, who only
spoke English, on a daily basis. You say you barely
spoke English, yet you had a job that required you to
have a command of the English language. You have told a
tale at every turn, trying to blame everyone but
yourself, going so far as to have your attorney blame
the mother here at sentencing.

You have shown no remorse. You have accepted no responsibility. The jury has spoken and now the Court will speak.

It is the judgment of this Court that for the crime of criminal sexual act in the first degree, a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Class B violent felony, in violation of Penal Law section 130.50, subdivision 3, for which you stand convicted under indictment number 742N of 2014, and in satisfaction thereof, you are hereby sentenced to 15 years of incarceration with ten years of post-release supervision. That will keep you under the watchful eye of law enforcement for the next 25 years. On the charge of endangering the welfare of a child, a Class A misdemeanor, in violation of Penal Law section 260.10, subdivision 1, you are sentenced to one year incarceration, to run concurrent to the 15 years. There will be a \$300 surcharge, a Crime Victim Assistance fee of \$25, a DNA fee of \$50, a SORA fee of \$50 and a supplemental Crime Victim Assistance fee of \$1,000. There will be a permanent order of protection issued in this case. People, I ask you to get that ready shortly. MR. PERRI: We have already handed it up, your Honor. THE COURT: Very good, and we will adjust the year accordingly for the sentence. Additionally, Mr. Ramos, you will be subject to sex offender registration at the time of your release

from incarceration and you are ordered to pay

1	restitution in the amount of \$190.44. That is payable
2	to Medicaid slash
3	MR. BERGER: I didn't get the sum, Judge.
4	THE COURT: \$190.44 and that is payable to
5	Medicaid/DS, and Mr. Berger, if you need the statement
6	that shows that amount, we can provide a copy to you
7	with regards to that.
8	MR. BERGER: Yes, I would like that.
9	THE COURT: All right, and we'll make sure we
10	take care of that.
11	Mr. Berger, do you want the fees and
12	surcharges by civil judgment?
13	MR. BERGER: I do, please.
1.4	THE COURT: All right. But I am going to
15	allow it to be taken out of inmate funds.
16	THE CLERK: Is he right-handed or left-handed?
17	We need him to sign the order of protection.
18	THE COURT: All right. The defendant has
19	signed in open court the order of protection, which he
20	will receive a copy of shortly.
21	Mr. Ramos, just so you hear it from the Court,
22	you are ordered to stay away from the individual listed
23	in this order, Miss Mya Feliciano Ramirez, wherever she
24	might be, including her home, school, place of business
25	and place of employment. You cannot get in touch with

1	Miss Ramirez in any way, shape or form, no letter	
2	writing, no telephone calls, no electronic communication	
3	and you cannot ask friends, family members, fellow	
4	inmates or even perfect strangers to get in touch with	
5	her on your behalf.	
6	Additionally, you cannot commit any of the	
7	acts listed in this order against Miss Ramirez and upon	
8	your release from incarceration, if you are in	
9	possession of any of the weapons listed in this order,	
10	you must surrender them to the Nassau County Police	
11	Department.	
12	This order is valid through July 23rd of 2038.	
13	Do you understand the restrictions placed upon you,	
14	Mr. Ramos, by this order?	
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.	
16	THE COURT: The Court is signing the order and	
17	it is now issued.	
18	People, anything else for the record?	
19	MR. PERRI: No, your Honor.	
20	THE COURT: Mr. Berger, anything else for the	
21	record?	
22	MR. BERGER: No, your Honor.	
23	THE COURT: Thank you. Good luck to you, sir.	
24	THE CLERK: Mr. Ramos, you have the right to	
25	appeal from this sentence and these proceedings. If you	

wish to appeal, you must file your notice of appeal with 1 2 the clerk of this court within 30 days. If you cannot 3 afford a lawyer or the minutes of these proceedings, you 4 may make application to the Appellate Division which will, upon being satisfied that you cannot afford the 5 same, order that an attorney be appointed and the 6 minutes provided without any charge to you. Your lawyer 7 is directed by the Court to advise you in full and to 8 9 take necessary steps the indicated by you in this 10 regard. And let the record reflect that I am serving 11 12 upon the defendant a copy of the order of protection. 13 am also serving defense counsel with a copy and the 14 People with two copies of the order of protection. 15 MR. BERGER: Acknowledge receipt. Let the 16 record reflect that we do intend to appeal this matter. 17 Our office will appeal it. 18 I, Cindy Kaye-Fink, Senior Court Reporter, hereby 19 20 certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript 21 of the within proceedings. 22 23

Court Reporter

24

25